REMARKS

Applicants have amended claim 1 and canceled claim 18.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 12 and 13 are rejected under U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Sakamoto et al. (US 2005/0122030).

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

> ... forming a barrier array, **the barrier array comprising a shadow mask and an insulative layer formed on the shadow mask**, the shadow mask defining a plurality of openings according to the pixel pattern of the field emission display ... (Emphasis added.)

Sakamoto '030 does not disclose or suggest a step to form a barrier array that includes a shadow mask and an insulative layer formed on the shadow mask, as required by claim 1, as amended. Sakamoto '030 only discloses a screen printing method to form a peel layer 28 on a surface 24 of a substrate 22 (see Fig. 4; pages 19 and 20, para. [0179]). In this screen printing method, a screen 32 and a squeegee 34, as assistant tools, are used to facilitate performing the screen printing method. That is to say, the barrier array formed in Sakamoto '030 does not include a shadow mask, nor does it suggest one, at least in the manner claimed. Therefore, Sakamoto '030, alone or in combination with any of the other cited references, fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each and every element of claim 1, as amended.

In addition, a step of forming a barrier array, as provided in amended claim 1, produces new and unexpected results. The method employs a known technology for making a shadow mask in the field emission display field. A thickness and a material of each of the shadow mask and the insulative material can be selected according to the particular requirements of the field emission display. Moreover, the barrier array may be formed of a sufficient size so that it can be subdivided for used in one or more field emission displays. Thus, the present invention provides a method for making field emission displays in low costs and a mass production. Therefore, amended claim 1 is patentable over Sakamoto '030 under U.S.C. 102 and 103.

Accordingly, claim 1, as amended, is now in condition for allowance, the allowance of which is hereby respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 12 and 13 each are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 12 and 13 should also be allowable.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto et al. (US 2005/0122030). Applicants submit that claims 2 and 4 each are directly dependent from now-allowable claim 1 and, as such, are now in condition for allowance, the allowance of which is hereby respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 14-17 are in the condition for allowance; and that claims 7-11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the subject matter of the base claim and any intervening claim, for which consideration the Examiner is respectfully thanked. None of claims 7-11 have been rewritten in independent form at this juncture of prosecution. Applicants instead respectfully submit that such claims are in condition for allowance, due to their dependency from now-allowable claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, the present application as defined in the pending claims is considered to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Zhaofu Hu et al.

By _____

Jeffrey T. Knapp
Registration No.: 45,384
Foxconn International, Inc.
1650 Memorex Drive
Santa Clara, CA 95050
Tel. No.: 714/626-1229